From: "Ginger James" <gjames@bankoftampa.com> on 02/15/2006 04:20:01 PM

Subject: Interagency Concentrations in Commercial Real Estate Lending

Ginger James 601 Bayshore Boulevard, Suite 625 Tampa, FL 33606-2747

February 15, 2006

Jennifer Johnson

Dear Jennifer Johnson:

I am writing to comment on the Guidance being proposed regarding commercial real estate lending. Commercial real estate lending is an extremely important part Florida's economy. As such, it is an extremely important part of bank lending.

The need for sound lending and sound loan portfolios is understood. However, my concern is that the Guidance as announced will have a negative effect on my institution and the Florida economy as a whole.

My concerns are not so much with the individual practices set out in the Guidance, but rather with the way the Guidance is imposed. We have encountered experiences where examiners impose even existing regulations differently than they had previously done. The proposed Guidance contains certain thresholds and a laundry list of practices and requirements. I am concerned that the rules of the game have suddenly changed.

Specifically there are several points we would like for the Guidance to make clear. First, that in looking at concentrations there will not be a one size fits all response. Each of our institutions has a different history, different controls, different portfolios, and different markets. When those in the field determine there is a concentration any response needs to be tailored for the specific circumstances.

Second, we hope the Guidance will make it very clear that if the concentration thresholds are exceeded it does not automatically require a capital increase. Any increase should be in the context of the circumstances of the particular institution.

Third, the Guidance should expressly indicate that its purpose is not to discourage commercial real estate lending.

If the Guidance is imposed in a mechanical or arbitrary manner or if it is intended to effect a policy shift discouraging commercial real estate lending then I fear grave consequences. Secured real estate lending has been the bread and butter of banks in Florida. If such loans are not available then will we have to look to other types of credits which historically have been more risky?

Perhaps most important, if the message is perceived to be that commercial real estate lending has great regulatory risk, then such loans will significantly diminish. This will lead to a downturn in our economy that

will create systemic problems for banks far beyond the risk of commercial real estate loans.

I thank you for your consideration of these concerns and comments and hope that the final Guidance will address them in a meaningful way

Sincerely,

Ginger James, The Bank of Tampa